

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 MERCER PUBLISHING INC., et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 SMART COOKIE INK, LLC, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C12-0188JLR

ORDER DENYING SUMMARY
JUDGMENT

15 MERCER PUBLISHING INC., et al.,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 TESTINGMOM.COM, LLC, et al.,

19 Defendants.

CASE NO. C12-0550JLR

20 This matter comes before the Court on a motion for summary judgment brought
21 by Defendants Smart Cookie Ink, LLC ("Smart Cookie"), and TestingMom.com, LLC
22 ("TestingMom"). (Mot. (Dkt. # 46).) Defendants make test preparation materials for

1 elementary-aged children taking standardized academic placement tests—so do Plaintiffs
2 Mercer Publishing Inc. (“Mercer”) and its members. Mercer sued Defendants for
3 copyright infringement, alleging that Defendants copied Mercer’s test preparation
4 materials. (*See generally* 12-0188 Compl. (12-0188 Dkt. # 1); 12-0550 Compl. (12-0550
5 Dkt. # 1).) Defendants now move for summary judgment against Mercer. However,
6 Defendants’ principal argument for summary judgment is flawed, undermining the
7 remainder of their arguments. There are still genuine issues of material fact in this case
8 preventing the court from deciding the claims as a matter of law, and as such, summary
9 judgment is not appropriate at this time. Considering itself fully advised, having
10 considered the governing law, the record, and the submissions of the parties, the court
11 DENIES the motion (Dkt. # 46).

12 I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

13 The parties disagree substantially about the substance of their claims in this case
14 and about the facts underlying those claims. Mercer claims that TestingMom and Smart
15 Cookie have illegally distributed practice exams and related materials in violation of
16 Mercer’s copyrights.¹ (*See generally* 12-0188 Compl.; 12-0550 Compl.) In response,
17 Defendants counterclaim that Mercer illegally marginalizes competition through false
18 accusations of infringement and by sending unwarranted cease-and-desist letters and
19 take-down notices. (*See generally* 12-0550 Ans. (12-0550 Dkt. # 8); 12-0188 Ans. (12-
20

21 ¹ Mercer originally filed separate complaints against Smart Cookie and TestingMom, but
22 the court consolidated the two suits for pre-trial purposes on May 31, 2012. (*See* 12-0188 Dkt.
20; 12-0550 Dkt. # 19.)

1 0188 Dkt. # 13).) For the most part, this motion challenges only a specific aspect of
2 Mercer's claim: that Mercer never registered its copyrights and therefore cannot
3 prosecute an action for infringement.

4 II. ANALYSIS

5 A. Summary Judgment Standard

6 Summary judgment is appropriate only if the evidence, when viewed in the light
7 most favorable to the non-moving party, demonstrates "that there is no genuine dispute as
8 to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R.
9 Civ. P. 56(a); *see Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986); *Galen v. Cnty. of*
10 *L.A.*, 477 F.3d 652, 658 (9th Cir. 2007). The moving party bears the initial burden of
11 showing there is no genuine issue of material fact and that he or she is entitled to prevail
12 as a matter of law. *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 323. If the moving party meets his or her
13 burden, then the non-moving party "must make a showing sufficient to establish a
14 genuine dispute of material fact regarding the existence of the essential elements of his
15 case that he must prove at trial" in order to withstand summary judgment. *Galen*, 477
16 F.3d at 658.

17 [T]he issue of material fact required by Rule 56(c) to be present to entitle a
18 party to proceed to trial is not required to be resolved conclusively in favor
19 of the party asserting its existence; rather, all that is required is that
20 sufficient evidence supporting the claimed factual dispute be shown to
21 require a jury or judge to resolve the parties' differing versions of the truth
22 at trial.

1 *First Nat. Bank of Ariz. v. Cities Serv. Co.*, 391 U.S. 253, 288-89 (1968). The court is
2 “required to view the facts and draw reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to
3 the [non-moving] party.” *Scott v. Harris*, 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007).

4 **B. Defendants’ Principal Argument For Summary Judgment is Flawed**

5 Defendants make one primary argument in this motion: that summary judgment is
6 appropriate because there is no genuine issue of material fact that Mercer failed to validly
7 register its copyrights, a prerequisite to filing a copyright infringement action. (Memo. of
8 Points and Authorities (Dkt. # 46-1) at 6-8.) Defendants argue that Mercer cannot bring a
9 copyright action without proving it validly registered its copyright. (*Id.*) Thus,
10 Defendants’ entire argument rests upon the premise that there is no dispute that Mercer
11 failed to register its copyrights (i.e., that there is no genuine issue of material fact on this
12 point). (*See id.*)

13 But this is demonstrably false—Mercer vigorously disputes this fact and supports
14 its claim with summary judgment evidence. (Response (Dkt. # 52) at 4-7; Decl. of
15 Rachel Hubbard (Dkt. # 53) Ex. A.) A genuine issue of material fact exists if there is
16 “sufficient evidence supporting the claimed factual dispute” so as to require “a jury or
17 judge to resolve the parties’ differing versions of the truth at trial.” *First Nat. Bank*, 391
18 U.S. at 288-89. Valid copyright registration is typically established by producing a
19 copyright registration certificate. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 410(c) (“[T]he certificate of
20 registration . . . shall constitute prima facie evidence of the validity of the
21 copyright . . .”). Here, Mercer has produced copyright registration certificates for all of
22 the allegedly infringed copyrights. (Decl. of Rachel Hubbard Ex. A.) Defendants do not

1 dispute the authenticity of these documents, nor do they present any evidence to rebut
2 them. (*See generally* Memo. of Points and Authorities) Therefore, Mercer has made a
3 *prima facie* case of valid copyright registration and has provided sufficient evidence that
4 this factual dispute should be resolved at trial.

5 Defendants wrongly argue that Mercer's dispute is not genuine because Mercer
6 can prove valid registration only by producing "deposit copies" of the allegedly infringed
7 works. A "deposit copy" is a duplicate of the copyrighted work that applicants are
8 required to deposit with the Copyright Office when they apply for copyright protection.
9 *See generally* 2 M. NIMMER & D. NIMMER, NIMMER ON COPYRIGHT § 7.17 (2012).

10 Defendants provide no authority to support the novel proposition that a deposit copy is
11 required to prove copyright ownership. Indeed, the language of the copyright statute
12 suggests the opposite is true, *see* 17 U.S.C. § 410(c) ("[T]he *certificate of*
13 *registration . . .* shall constitute *prima facie* evidence of the validity of the
14 copyright . . .") (emphasis added), and case law suggests the same. *Thomas v. Artino*,
15 723 F. Supp. 2d 822, 830 (D. Md. 2010) (rejecting the argument that copyright plaintiff
16 must produce deposit copy to prove copyright registration). The court rejects
17 Defendants' argument.

18 **C. Defendants' Additional Arguments for Summary Judgment Also Fail**


19 Defendants make several other arguments for summary judgment, but these
20 arguments are constructed in such a way that, the first argument having failed, the rest
21 must fail as well. (*See* Memo. of Points and Authorities at 11, 17.) Defendants' other
22 arguments all focus on just one copyright: the sole copyright for which Defendants were

1 able to obtain a deposit copy. (*See id.*) Defendants limited their arguments in this way
2 because they assumed all other copyright claims would be dismissed on summary
3 judgment for the reasons rejected above. (Reply (Dkt. # 60) at 2.) This has not
4 happened. In light of this, the court finds that it would be at best unhelpful and at worst
5 impossible to rule on the remainder of Defendants' arguments without knowing how they
6 apply to all of the copyrights at issue.

7 III. CONCLUSION

8 For the foregoing reasons, the court DENIES Defendants' motion for summary
9 judgment (Dkt. # 46).

10 Dated this 21st day of November, 2012.

11 
12 JAMES L. ROBART
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22